YITP-07-05

arXiv:astro-ph/0702182v2 27 Mar 2007

Nonlinear curvature perturbations in an exactly soluble model of multi-component slow-roll inflation

Misao SASAKI
Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

Using the nonlinear δN formalism, we consider a simple exactly soluble model of multi-component slow-roll inflation in which the nonlinear curvature perturbation can be evaluated analytically.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 98.80.Cq

I. INTRODUCTION

Much attention has been paid to the possible non-Gaussian signatures in the curvature perturbations from inflation in recent years. It is now understood that the non-Gaussianity is generically too small to be detected in single inflaton models with canonical kinetic term, as long as the standard slow-roll condition is satisfied [1, 2]. Accordingly, various types of multi-component models have been and are studied [3, 4].

In this short note, assuming that all the components of the inflaton field are slow-rolling, we present a simple exactly soluble model and derive the nonlinear curvature perturbation analytically by using the δN formalism [5, 6, 7]. Although neither the model is compelling nor the result is particularly new, the analysis below is presented in the hope that it may shed some light on general properties of the non-Gaussianity from inflation.

II. MODEL

We consider a multi-component inflaton field with the potential

$$V(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = V_0 \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{A=1}^{M} m_A^2 \phi_A^2\right] , \tag{2.1}$$

where M is the number of components, and we use the Planck units $\hbar = 8\pi G = 1$. We mention that single-field models with a similar but more general class of potentials was analyzed extensively in [8]. Using $dN = Hdt$ as the time variable, where H is the Hubble parameter, the slow-roll equations of motion are

$$\frac{\partial\phi_A}{\partial N} = -\frac{\partial_A V}{3H^2} = -\frac{\partial_A V}{V} = -m_A^2\phi_A \, , \tag{2.2}$$

where the second equality follows from the potential-dominated Friedmann equation, $3H^2 = V$. This can be immediately solved to give

$$\phi_A(N, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = C_A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \exp\left[-m_A^2 N\right] , \tag{2.3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_{M-1})$ is a set of parameters that specifies each trajectory in the field space.

If the potential (2.1) were valid everywhere in the field space, inflation would never end. We therefore assume that there is a 'waterfall' in the field space near the origin as in the hybrid inflation scenario [9]. For simplicity, we assume that inflation ends when a trajectory reaches at an $(M-1)$-dimensional deformed sphere Σ given by

$$\sum_{A=1}^{M} m_A^{2q}\phi_A^2 = D^2 \, , \tag{2.4}$$

where q is a constant.

Now for the later convenience when we apply the δN formalism, we invert the direction of N and set $N = 0$ when inflation ends, that is, when a trajectory crosses the surface given by (2.4),

$$N \to -N \, ; \quad \phi_A(0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \in \Sigma \, . \tag{2.5}$$

Thus solution (2.3) is re-expressed as

$$\phi_A(N,\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = C_A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \exp\left[m_A^2 N\right] . \tag{2.6}$$

Given the above solution, we may regard $(N, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_{M-1})$ as another set of coordinates in the field space [6]. Then the coordinate N is determined by the relation,

$$D^2 = \sum_{A=1}^{M} m_A^{2q} \phi_A^2 \exp\left[-2m_A^2 N\right] . \tag{2.7}$$

This implicitly gives N as a function of the original coordinates $\boldsymbol{\phi}$,

$$N = N(\phi_1, \phi_2, \cdots, \phi_M) . \tag{2.8}$$

As an example, let us consider the case of a two-component field. Then the solution is given by

$$\phi_1 = \frac{D}{m_1^q} \cos\lambda \exp[m_1^2 N] , \quad \phi_2 = \frac{D}{m_2^q} \sin\lambda \exp[m_2^2 N] , \tag{2.9}$$

where λ parametrizes different inflationary trajectories. We mention that a parametric expression for two slow-roll fields in terms of N and an angle between the two fields similar to λ was derived in [10]. Eliminating λ from the above, we obtain N as a function of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2.

III. CURVATURE PERTURBATION

In the δN-formalism, the final amplitude of the curvature perturbation on comoving slices $\mathcal{R}_c$ (or equivalently on uniform total density slices ζ) is given by δN, where δN is the perturbation of the e-folding number between the initial flat time-slice at $t = t_*$ when the scale of interest came out of the horizon during inflation and a comoving slice at $t = t_{\rm fin}$ during the final radiation-dominated stage by which all the inflationary trajectories have converged to a unique one [5, 6]. (We assume isocurvature perturbations are negligible.)

Then the (linear) curvature perturbation spectrum is given by [11]

$$\frac{4\pi k^3}{(2\pi)^3} P_S(k) \equiv \left\langle \zeta^2(t_{\rm fin}) \right\rangle_k = \left\langle \delta N^2 \right\rangle_k = \left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2_{t_{\rm k}} \sum_A \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A}\right)^2_{t_{\rm k}} , \tag{3.1}$$

where t_k is the horizon-crossing time of the comoving wavenumber k. Here we have assumed that there is no additional contribution to δN after inflation. If there is such a contribution as in the curvaton scenario [3], it should be added to the above. It is also noted that the tensor perturbation has the amplitude $8H^2/(2\pi)^2$ so that the tensor-to-scalar ratio is given by [11]

$$\frac{P_T}{8P_S} = \frac{1}{\displaystyle\sum_A \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A}\right)^2_{t_{\rm k}}} . \tag{3.2}$$

Thus, the observational constraint that the left-hand side is more or less smaller than unity [12] implies

$$\sum_A \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A}\right)^2_{t_{\rm k}} \gtrsim 1 . \tag{3.3}$$

The partial derivatives $\partial N/\partial \phi_A$ can be evaluated from equation (2.7) as

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A} = \frac{m_A^{2q} \phi_A \exp[-2m_A^{2q} N(\boldsymbol{\phi})]}{\sum_B m_B^{2q+2} \phi_B^2 \exp[-2m_B^2 N(\boldsymbol{\phi})]} , \tag{3.4}$$

where N in the right-hand side of the equation is to be regarded as a function of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. For the purpose of evaluating the spectrum, it is more convenient to express the above in terms of N and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Noting equations (2.6) and (2.7), we find

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A} = \frac{n_A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) m_A^q \exp[-m_A^2 N]}{D \sum_B n_B^2(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) m_B^2} ; \quad \sum_A n_A^2 = 1 , \tag{3.5}$$

where $n_A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is a unit vector which determines the trajectory. For the two-component case, using the solution given by equation (2.9), the above reduces to

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_1} = \frac{m_1^q \cos\lambda \exp[-m_1^2 N]}{D\left(m_1^2\cos^2\lambda + m_2^2\sin^2\lambda\right)}\,, \quad \frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_2} = \frac{m_2^q \sin\lambda \exp[-m_2^2 N]}{D\left(m_1^2\cos^2\lambda + m_2^2\sin^2\lambda\right)}\,. \tag{3.6}$$

The nonlinear δN is simply given by

$$\delta N = N(\boldsymbol{\phi} + \delta\boldsymbol{\phi}) - N(\boldsymbol{\phi})\,, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\delta\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is the field perturbation on the flat slice at the horizon-crossing time $t = t_*$. Taking partial derivatives of equation (3.4) with respect to ϕ_A repeatedly, the nonlinear δN can be easily evaluated to an arbitrary order,

$$\delta N = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{\partial^n N}{\partial\phi_{A_1}\partial\phi_{A_2}\cdots\partial\phi_{A_n}} \delta\phi_{A_1}\delta\phi_{A_2}\cdots\delta\phi_{A_n}\,. \tag{3.8}$$

Since it is not particularly illuminating to spell out the explicit formulae for higher partial derivatives of N, we do not give them here. Instead let us make a rough order of magnitude evaluation of them. The CMB observations [12, 13] tell us that

$$\left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2 \sum_A \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A}\right)^2 \sim 10^{-10}\,. \tag{3.9}$$

Thus typically we have

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi_A} = O\left(\frac{e^{-m^2 N}}{m^2 \phi_f}\right) \sim 10^{-5} H^{-1}\,, \tag{3.10}$$

where m and ϕ_f are the typical magnitudes of m_A and ϕ_A $(A = 1, 2, \cdots, M)$, respectively, such that $m^q \phi_f = D$. It should be noted that m^2 must be smaller than unity for the slow-roll condition to hold (see equation (2.2)).

For the evaluation of the order of magnitude of higher derivatives, we may take the derivatives of equation (3.5) by ignoring the dependence of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ on $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Then we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^n N}{\partial \phi^n} \sim m^{2n-2} \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi}\right)^n\,. \tag{3.11}$$

Thus if the magnitude of $m^2(\partial N/\partial\phi)$ is greater than unity, the higher derivatives become larger than the first derivative $\partial N/\partial\phi$. Nevertheless, if we quantify the non-Gaussianity by the magnitude of the nth order term relative to the nth power of the linear term, such as the $f_{\rm NL}$ parameter for the bi-spectrum [14], we find

$$\zeta_{(n)} \sim H^n \frac{\partial^n N}{\partial \phi^n} \sim m^{2n-2} H^n \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi}\right)^n \sim m^{2n-2} (\zeta_{(1)})^n\,, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\zeta_{(1)}$ stands for the linear part of the curvature perturbation and $\zeta_{(\rm n)}$ for the nth order part. Thus, we may conclude that the non-Gaussianity cannot be large unless either there exists a field component that violates the slow-roll condition or one invokes a mechanism that works after inflation.

Finally, it may be worthwhile to point out the fact that while δN is formulated in Fourier space in the linear case, it is formulated in real space in the nonlinear case [5]. Thus $\delta\boldsymbol{\phi}$ in equation (3.8) is given in real space, $\delta\boldsymbol{\phi} = \delta\boldsymbol{\phi}(t, \boldsymbol{x})$, and t_* should be taken to be an epoch at which all the relevant scales are outside the Hubble horizon. This means $\delta\boldsymbol{\phi}$ may be affected by a small but non-trivial effect of evolution on superhorizon scales. Assuming the linear evolution equations are still valid for $\delta\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we have

$$\delta\phi_A(t_*) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \left(\hat{a}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \varphi_k^A(t_*) e^{i\boldsymbol{k}\boldsymbol{x}} + h.c.\right)\,, \tag{3.13}$$

where $\hat{a}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ is the annihilation operator for the Bunch-Davis vacuum and $\varphi_k^A(t)$ is the positive frequency function as usual, and

$$\varphi_k^A(t_*) = \frac{(\partial\phi_A/\partial N)(t_*)}{(\partial\phi_A/\partial N)(t_k)} \varphi_k^A(t_k)\,; \quad \frac{4\pi k^3}{(2\pi)^3} |\varphi_k^A(t_k)|^2 = \left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2_{t_k}\,. \tag{3.14}$$

For cosmological scales of interest which span only a few e-foldings, however, this effect may be negligible in most cases.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) No. 14102004, (B) No. 17340075, and (A) No. 18204024.

[1] J. M. Maldacena, JHEP **0305**, 013 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0210603].
[2] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, JCAP **0506**, 003 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0503692].
[3] N. Bartolo, S. Matarrese and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 043503 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0309033].
C. Gordon and K. A. Malik, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 063508 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0311102].
K. Enqvist and S. Nurmi, JCAP **0510**, 013 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0508573].
D. H. Lyth, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **148**, 25 (2005).
K. A. Malik and D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0609**, 008 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0604387].
M. Sasaki, J. Valiviita and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 103003 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0607627].
J. Valiviita, M. Sasaki and D. Wands, arXiv:astro-ph/0610001.
[4] M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 043508 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0306006].
G. N. Felder and L. Kofman, arXiv:hep-ph/0606256.
L. Alabidi and D. Lyth, JCAP **0608**, 006 (2006) [arXiv:astro-ph/0604569].
[5] D. H. Lyth, K. A. Malik and M. Sasaki, JCAP **0505**, 004 (2005) [arXiv:astro-ph/0411220].
[6] M. Sasaki and T. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99**, 763 (1998) [arXiv:gr-qc/9801017].
[7] D. Wands, K. A. Malik, D. H. Lyth and A. R. Liddle, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043527 (2000) [arXiv:astro-ph/0003278].
[8] P. Parsons and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 6757 (1995) [arXiv:astro-ph/9501086].
[9] A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 748 (1994) [arXiv:astro-ph/9307002].
[10] D. Polarski and A. A. Starobinsky, Nucl. Phys. B **385**, 623 (1992).
[11] M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, Prog. Theor. Phys. **95**, 71 (1996) [arXiv:astro-ph/9507001].
[12] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0603449.
[13] G. F. Smoot *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **396**, L1 (1992).
C. L. Bennett *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **464**, L1 (1996) [arXiv:astro-ph/9601067].
[14] E. Komatsu and D. N. Spergel, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 063002 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0005036].